





UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.ispic.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/747,852	12/22/2000	James R. Patterson	A-5378	3665
2147 7:	590 11/27/2002			
GRACE J FISHEL 11970 BORMAN DRIVE SUITE 220			EXAMINER	
			REIS, TRAVIS M	
ST. LOUIS, MO 63146			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2859	
			DATE MAII ED: 11/27/2002	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	_	•
	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	09/747,852	PATTERSON, JAMES R.
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit
	Travis M Reis	2859
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED 18 November 2002 FAILS TO PLA Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	avoid abandonment of this application at its application at its application at its application at the applic	ation. A proper reply to a high places the application in
PERIOD FOR R	EPLY [check either a) or b)]	
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailib The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WA 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offimely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth a later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing SFILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF The date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount of the shortened statutory period for reply fice later than three months after the ma	ng date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP FR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension out of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered to	because:	
(a) 🛛 they raise new issues that would require furth	ner consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note	below);	
(c)	in better form for appeal by mate	erially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cance	eling a corresponding number of t	inally rejected claims.
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.		
Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ction(s):	
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	d be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely filed amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: _		idered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen explanation of how the new or amended claims v		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows	£	
Claim(s) allowed: 6-10 and 12-16.		
Claim(s) objected to: 11.		
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1</u> .		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	s a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapp	proved by the Examiner.
9 \(\tag{Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement	ent(s)(PTO-1449) Paner No(s)	

Diego Gutierrez

10. Other: ____

Application No. 09/747,852

Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)

Continuation of 2. NOTE: The change in claim 1, i.e. deleting "the gauging means including rieans for assessing the true status of a frame in relation to three dimensional space", is considered to raise a new issue as the finally rejected claim had the gauging means including both "a plumb bob" & "means for assessing the true status of a frame in relation to three dimensional space", while the now amended claim only requires the gauging means to include a plumb bob.